

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 11 remain in the application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to because Fig. 3 was not described in the detailed description of the invention. Therefore, applicant has amended the specification to include a reference to Fig. 3 where appropriate. Applicant also added a new reference in the specification to Fig. 4.

Claims 1 – 4 and 7 were rejected under Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Shono (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,125). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Shono discloses a light interception hood 16 including a substantially rectangular tubular hood body 16a made of **light intercepting material**. The light interception hood 16 also includes a magnifier 17 and a peripheral foot portion 16b in the form of a flange that can be detachably attached to a mounting shoe 12. The mounting shoe 12 is part of the LCD 11 of the camera 10 and may be a pair of vertical rails 12a that receive the flange 16b.

In contrast, the present invention is a protector accessory that includes a clear cap that mounts over a digital camera LCD screen and protects the LCD screen. The protector accessory allows the LCD screen to be viewed from a distance. With reference to claim 1 of the present application, a protective device in accordance with the present invention includes a frame 30 adapted to fit around the edges of a camera viewfinder 24 (the viewfinder including an LCD screen). The frame includes connectors 32 for connecting the frame to edges of the viewfinder. The protective device also includes a window viewing portion 34 surrounded and supported by the frame and providing unobstructed viewing of the LCD screen through the window. This structure is not taught or suggested by Shono. To begin, Shono does not teach or suggest a window viewing portion surrounded and supported by a frame and providing unobstructed viewing of an LCD screen as in the present invention. In Shono, the magnifier (“viewer”) is part of the light intercepting hood and is not surrounded by nor supported by a frame.

Second, the device of Shono does not provide unobstructed view of the LCD screen. In fact, aside from the magnifier, the entire device of Shono is opaque; the hood body 16a is made of light intercepting material to obstruct light from passing either into or out of the hood. Further, in Shono, because of the inherent structure of the magnifier and the fact that the magnifier is the only portion of the device that allows light to pass, a user of the Shono device must put his/her eye directly up to the magnifier to view the LCD screen. In contrast, in the present invention, the protective device is clear and provides unobstructed viewing of a camera LCD screen. Further, the present invention does not include a magnifier. Therefore, a user of the present invention may view the camera LCD screen without obstruction with the user's eye at any distance, even a great distance, from the protective device of the present invention. Again, as stated above, Shono is inherently incapable of such a use, and therefore does not teach or suggest the present invention.

Third, the device of Shono includes "a substantially rectangular tubular hood body." The present invention is not tubular but instead is a cap. Particularly, the protective device of the present invention includes a generally two-dimensional frame and a generally planar window viewing portion surrounded and supported by the frame. Hence, for the reasons stated here and above, claim 1 is allowable over Shono.

With respect to claim 2, Shono does not teach or suggest a mount adapted to mount a glare reduction device to the frame of a protective device. In Shono, the device itself is a light intercepting hood (glare reduction device). There is no mount on the light intercepting hood of Shono for mounting a glare reduction device to the hood. For the same reasons, Shono does not teach or suggest the mount on the protective device being a tab, or a protective device in combination with a glare reduction device adapted to mount to the frame of the protective device, as claimed in claims 3 and 4. Also, Shono does not teach or suggest a protective device in combination with a glare reduction device wherein the glare reduction device includes at least three rigid side members. Moreover, claims 2 – 4 and 7, depending either directly or indirectly from an allowable base claim (claim 1), are also themselves allowable.

For these reasons, applicant submits that claims 1 - 4 and 7 are allowable over Shono. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the Section 102(e) rejection of claims 1 - 4 and 7 as being anticipated by Shono be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 6, 8, and 9 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shono in view of Harvey (U.S. Patent No. 3,677,160). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments made above with respect to Shono. As argued above, Shono does not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed in claim 1. Therefore, claims 5, 6, 8, and 9, depending either directly or indirectly from claim 1, are patentable over Shono and any further combination of Shono with Harvey. Hence, applicant requests that the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 5, 6, 8, and 9 based upon Shono in view of Harvey be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shono in view of Harvey in further view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,211,823, hereinafter "Suzuki"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicant incorporates by reference the arguments made above with respect to Shono. As argued above, Shono does not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed in claim 1. Therefore, claims 10 and 11, depending indirectly from claim 1, are patentable over Shono and any further combination of Shono with Harvey and Suzuki. Hence, applicant requests that the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 10 and 11 based upon Shono in view of Harvey in further view of Suzuki be withdrawn.

This amendment and request for reconsideration is believed to be fully responsive to the rejections and comments of the examiner and to place this application in condition for allowance. Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert P. Schmidt

Fildes & Outland, P.C.



Christopher J. Fildes, Attorney
Registration No. 32,132
20916 Mack Avenue, Suite 2
Grosse Pointe Woods, MI 48236
(313) 885-1500